

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/768,426	01/29/2004	Ruey-Jen Hwu	HWUJ122333	6975
75	90 02/13/2006		EXAM	INER
Paul C. Oestreich			NGUYEN, DUNG T	
	RYANT COMPAGNI, P. 1 Street, Suite 700	C.	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
Salt Lake City, UT 84101			2828	

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<b>y</b>				
	10/768,426	HWU, RUEY-JEN					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Dung (Michael) T. Nguyen	2828					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this commu D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 D     This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This     Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		rits is				
Disposition of Claims							
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1.4.5.8 and 15 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2.3.6.7 and 9-14 is/a 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1.4-5.8 and 15 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	re withdrawn from consideration.	·					
Application Papers							
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2004 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.	• •				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
Attachment(s)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/30/04.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		·)				

Art Unit: 2828

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1, 4-5, 8, and 15 in the reply filed on 12/27/05 is acknowledged.

## Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract contains more than 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

#### Claim Objections

Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: the semiconductor laser should emit an infrared laser light. Appropriate correction is required.

#### **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned

with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 4-5, and 8 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 14-15, and 23 of U.S. Patent No. 6414973.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the individual claims 1, 14-15, and 23 of the conflicting patent disclose the same characteristics as called in the claims 1, 4-5, and 8 of this present application.

Claim 15 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 23 of Hwu et al. U.S. Patent No. 6414973 in view of Colak U.S. Patent No. 5046803. Hwu et al. disclose all limitations of the claim 23 except for the semiconductor laser emitting an infrared laser light. Colak teaches the semiconductor laser emitting an infrared laser light (column 1, lines 35-36). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Hwu et al. what is taught by Colak because the semiconductor laser emitting infrared laser light used in conjunction with the frequency doubling device to provide blue laser light is inexpensive and widely available (column 1, lines 26-37).

Application/Control Number: 10/768,426

Art Unit: 2828

# Page 4

### Communication Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung (Michael) T Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1949. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 17:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Min Harvey can be reached on (571) 272-1835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-3329.

Michael Dy W

Michael Dung Nguyen

01/20/06